DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 865 HE 009 431

TITLE	Access and Assistance: The Study of ECE/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education. Summary Report.
INSTITUTION	Evaluation and Training Inst., Los Angeles, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	37p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Evaluation and Training Institute, 11110 Ohio Avenue, Suite 202, Los Angeles, CA 90025
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Government Role; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; Program Descriptions; *State Action; *State Colleges; State Legislation; *State Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

The study of California's educational opportunity programs (EOPs) in public higher education was prompted by the requirement within a state assembly bill. The study's two phases were: (1) the collection of data from state files; and (2) intensive site visits to a selection of institutions. The purpose was to understand the differences in program underlying dynamics and environmental factors. The major data findings cover the students of EOPs (sex and ethnicity, academic ability and programs, and income and financial assistance) and special support services. It is concluded that even though the EOPs reach a limited number of students (particularly as compared with other compensatory education programs in the United States), they have made a major difference in the lives of many individuals for whom it provided the opportunity for a college education. The study provides descriptive data and some commentary, but is not evaluative. (MSE)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146865

Access and Assistance
The Study of EOP/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education

Summary Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Evaluation & Training Institute

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

HE009431

EVALUATION AND TRAINING INSTITUTE
An inter-disciplinary center for research, training, evaluation and policy studies

Los Angeles, California

© 1977 The Evaluation and Training Institute

All rights reserved. Except as explicitly permitted herein, no part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy and recording, without permission in writing from The Evaluation and Training Institute.

11110 Ohio Avenue, Suite 202
Los Angeles, California 90025

ACCESS AND ASSISTANCE: THE STUDY OF EOP/EOPS IN CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

SUMMARY REPORT

Contracted By:

The California Postsecondary Education Commission

Conducted By:

Evaluation and Training Institute

1976

INTRODUCTION

Assembly Bill No. 1478 expressed ". . . the intent of the Legislature that a comprehensive study of educational opportunity programs for students attending the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, and the California Community Colleges shall be made." The Bill further stipulated that:

> "The study shall, at a minimum:
>
> a. Tabulate the makeup of recipients with respect to income, ethnic background, and academic abilities of students served;
>
> b. assess the unmet financial need of student recipients;
>
> c. examine the resources needed to administer the programs; and
>
> d. examine the desirability of making the financial assistance available through other means, including consolidating existing state-funded grant programs."

A modest appropriation was made for conducting a study to fulfill this ambitious intent, and the task was assigned to the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) in consultation with the State Scholarship and Loan Commission (now the Student Aid Commission). The CPEC, in turn, contracted with the Evaluation and Training Institute (ETI) to conduct the study in accordance with the "Proposed Plan for the Study of EOP/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education".

While the language of the legislation was probably deliberately broad in scope, both the Bill and the Study Plan pre-supposed a comparatively simple, descriptive piece of research. The data to be gathered, organized and reported were either those conventional variables which the programs, institutions and/or segmental information systems might be expected to have gathered routinely and/or those which might reasonably be gathered by the ETI study team through observation and interviews with appropriate EOP/EOPS constituents. The report of these data would provide legislators and educators with basic information about the constituents and operations of EOP/EOPS necessary to assess both the current status of the programs and the support needs they might require if their educational effectiveness is to be enhanced.

In the process of conducting the study, however, the ETI research team became keenly aware that the original conceptions of the data needs and sources would, by themselves, be woefully inadequate as descriptors of either the most important characteristics, strengths and weaknesses of current EOP/EOPS programs or the overriding issues and problems which occupy the minds and time of students, staff and institutional administrators who are associated with EOP/EOPS.

In addition, the research team agreed that it was essential that these characteristics, issues and problems be prominently

explicated in the report for the benefit of those whose responsibility it is to make decisions which affect the viability and future directions of these programs for disadvantaged students. Only with a full understanding of the psycho-social contexts in which the programs operate and of the existing problems in analyzing available data can the data which are presented be adequately analyzed and evaluated.

METHODOLOGY

The study plan proceeded in two phases. The first phase involved the collection of extant, quantifiable data from both CPEC files and the segment offices, and the second, intensive site visits to a selection of institutions for the purposes of understanding the differences in programs -- the underlying dynamics which contribute to the differences -- and the milieu, or environmental factors which influence the functioning of the programs.

In order to implement the first phase, the study plan called for the establishment of a Task Force, advisory to the research team, which consisted of representatives from each of the segment offices, the California Association of Student Financial Aid Administrators, the Student Aid Commission, the California Community College EOPS Directors Association and the California Postsecondary Education Commission. The purpose

of the first Task Force meeting was three-fold: first, to have a forum in which the ETI research team could explain to representatives of the various constituencies the purposes of the evaluation and to present the evaluation plan; second, to obtain advice and input from the various segment representatives in order to properly address the diversity of institutions and programs between and within segments and third, to determine sources of extant data and gain the support and cooperation of the various constituent groups in supplying the data.

The final set of research questions developed for the study were designed to address the guidelines established in Assembly Bill 1478 and fell into four categories: 1) financial aid; 2) support services and/or programs; 3) administration/ staffing; and 4) coordination of state-funded EOP/EOPS. The sources of data specific to the research question were extant -- available through segment or CPEC offices; local -- generated at the campus level; and site -- derived from individual and collective interviews at certain selected institutions.

Once the study plan and research questions were revised and extant data identified, the study team developed a Supplementary Data Request Form (SDRF) to obtain additional information from site visit campuses which was not available elsewhere, but which was needed to fully address the study's research questions. Information requested in this form included the amount of financial aid awarded to EOP/EOPS students, numbers of students with unmet

need and the average amount of that unmet need, average parental (and independent student) income for both EOP and all students, EOP staffing and resources, the existence of special services available to EOP/EOPS students and their cost and utilization, standardized test scores for both EOP and all students, retention rates of EOP/EOPS students through the 1974-75 academic year, and the number of entering EOP students by term.

The form was standardized across segments* so that each of the site visit institutions would report the data in the same format to facilitate comparisons among campuses and between segments. Unfortunately, however, because of the diversity of program foci and funding, campus data collection and reporting procedures are not standardized (and are sometimes not even similar) even within segments. Thus, in many instances, campuses were not able to adhere to the form; as a result, some data-based comparisons were impossible.

The second phase of the study consisted of site visits at 26 colleges selected to represent diversity in institutional size, geographical location, urban/rural setting and other demongraphic factors which characterize EOP/EOPS programs statewide. The sample of colleges included 5 UC campuses, 9 CSUC campuses and 12 CCC campuses. Interviews were conducted with over 500 current and former EOP/EOPS students and over 650 college and university personnel.

*The only exception was the changing of "bona fide EOP students" to "officially eligible EOPS students" when used for the community colleges.

Since this study to some extent overlapped the purposes and procedures of a separate study of EOPS in the community college segment,* the site visit methodology was somewhat different for the 12 colleges chosen from the CCC. Both procedures are described below.

In preparation for the UC and CSUC site visits, preliminary site visits were conducted to more fully explain the purposes and methodology of the study, to answer questions regarding the Supplementary Data Request Form, and to clarify logistical arrangements necessary for the subsequent site visits. The final site visits were conducted by teams of interviewers, each composed of two members of the ETI study team, who spent at least two days at each campus.

For the community colleges, site teams were formed on the basis of nominations solicited from some 420 community college personnel, including all superintendents/presidents, deans or vice presidents for student services, deans or heads of counseling, EOPS directors, and officers of the state EOPS student organization. The goal was to select teams which were composed

---

*The Study of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services in California Community Colleges was conducted by the Evaluation and Training Institute under contract to the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges and completed in April, 1976. Hereafter in this report it is referred to as The Study of EOPS.

of, insofar as possible, a community college president, a dean-level representative of student services, a faculty member, an EOPS director/coordinator and a current or former EOPS student. In total, 497 persons were nominated to fill the thirty team positions needed (six teams of five persons each). Persons who received three or more nominations were invited to indicate their willingness to serve on the team. One hundred and fifteen persons accepted the invitation to be considered for team membership.

A final group of 30 persons was selected. An effort was made to include among each team representatives of different academic levels and ethnic backgrounds, as well as women and EOPS students. An effort was also made to involve persons from diverse colleges and districts, and wherever possible, to assign team members to site visits outside of their home regions. Each six-person team (including an ETI staff member) visited two community colleges, spending two days on each campus.

Visits to campuses in each segment included interviews with a wide cross-section of people -- EOP/EOPS directors, administrators, faculty members, counselors, financial aid office personnel, and current and former EOP/EOPS students. In the case of the community colleges, interviews also took place with members of governing boards, representatives of local advisory committees

and community schools and agencies and, in cases of multi-campus districts, a top-level representative of the district office -- the superintendent in all but one case.

Case study team members each took responsibility for concentrating on a few topical "tasks" previously specified. Teams also met for long sessions each evening to interrelate their interview notes on each topic. A tentative statement of the teams major observations were presented to officials of each college prior to departure from the campus. Those statements served as the basis for developing the case study profiles which are included in Volume II of the final report.

MAJOR FINDINGS

The Students of EOP/EOPS

Sex and Ethnicity. There is little doubt that EOP/EOPS in the three segments are meeting one of their major objectives -- facilitating the enrollment of increasing numbers of persons previously under-represented in California's public postsecondary institutions. The majority of EOP/EOPS students in each of the three segments are from minority racial or ethnic backgrounds. The male/female ratios among EOP/EOPS students are about equal, with a slightly higher proportion of females in the CCC.

The largest proportion of non-Caucasian students in each segment are Afro-Americans/Blacks; Mexican-Americans/Chicanos represent the second largest group. The smallest group represented in each segment is that of Native Americans, and correspondingly, the smallest proportion of EOP/EOPS students in the three segments are of this ethnic group.

Within each segment, however, there are wide variations between individual campuses. Some campuses have larger ethnic representations in their student enrollment generally -- most of which follow closely ethnic representations in the local community -- and similarly, some have larger and disparate ethnic representations in their EOP/EOPS enrollments. But on virtually all campuses in the UC and CSUC, the EOP students are "minority minorities" on their campuses. Even more, although EOP students account for approximately 30 percent of all non-Caucasian enrollments in both the UC and CSUC, some institutions in each of these segments would have virtually no minority enrollment were it not for EOP.

Academic Ability and Programs. The academic qualifications of EOP/EOPS students vary both within and between the three segments. In all three segments, EOP/EOPS students report lower entering high school grade point averages than do non-EOP/EOPS students, but generally increase their GPAs in college and maintain equal or better retention rates than non-EOP/EOPS students.

However, the data also show that, even though their admission requirements, as well as the populations from which they draw, are vastly different, both the UC and the CCC apparently identify and recruit more academically able than disadvantaged EOP/EOPS students. Although the figures vary among individual campuses, systemwide, almost 64 percent of the new 1974-75 EOP enrollees in the UC were admitted on a regular basis; only 36 percent were unable to meet the regular admission requirements and were admitted as special exceptions. The average high school GPA for these new EOP students

(regular and exception admit combined) was 2.95, only slightly under a B average; the GPA for first-time freshmen regular admits was 3.55.

There are no GPA or test requirements for admission to the community colleges. In order to be admitted to a community college in California, a person must have either graduated from high school or be 18 years old and able to profit from the instruction provided. Historically, community colleges have provided college access to individuals who either could not afford to attend the UC and CSUC and/or did not have the academic qualifications necessary for admission to either of those segments. While the mission of the CCC has expanded beyond these initial Master Plan objectives, attracting a wider range of students for a variety of reasons, many people interviewed in the site visits feel that, even though it is not specified in the legislation or any of the other guiding documents, EOPS in the community colleges was designed particularly for the potentially able, "high risk" student who needed special help not only to stay in college, but encouragement and assistance to enter in the first place. These individuals feel that the original target population for EOPS recruitment were the so-called "high risk" students, but that this is no longer the case since recruitment efforts now concentrate more on already enrolled students. As far as the data are concerned, they are correct, at least as far as the current population of EOPS students is concerned.

Based on high school grade averages reported by EOPS and non-EOPS students in The Study of EOPS, community college EOPS students are not academically disadvantaged. Forty-two percent

reported high school GPAs of B or above and 90 percent reported GPAs of C or above. Only 8 percent reported grades below a C-. Although it is impossible, of course, to determine if these students would really have been eligible for admission to the other 2 segments without their complete academic history (many community college students do not take the college preparatory programs in high school) as well as diagnostic assessment results, their GPAs, coupled with information gained in the site visits, suggest that these EOPS students are not that different, at least academically, from their fellow non-EOPS students within the CCC.

Of the three segments, the CSUC EOP clearly focuses much more on the high potential, disadvantaged student who is clearly academically ineligible for regular admission. The overwhelming majority of first time freshman EOP students enrolled in 1974-75 (89 percent) were admitted as exceptions under the provisions of Title 5. In fact, according to some of the persons interviewed, this was the intent of the Title 5 provision in the first place.

Moreover, according to these people, this provision has provided an insufficient number of exception slots to admit all of the eligible disadvantaged who apply. For each student admitted to EOP as an exception in 1974-75, at least two more were turned away because of the 4 percent limitation. This was particularly true on many campuses where the entire 4 percent is not allocated to EOP (according to site visit interviewees, the number varies from 1.5 to 3 percent). At the same time, other persons interviewed on the campus take exception to the limitation defined in Title 5 on

the number of regular admits that may be enrolled in the EOP. According to these people, there are plenty of admissable, potential EOP students who would be overlooked if EOP is thought of as exclusively a special admit program. Some of these students need the financial assistance; others need the EOP support services in order to cope with the "culturally alien environment of the university."

Income and Financial Assistance. Financial aid is a critical factor in extending the opportunity for higher education to disadvantaged and minority groups. The majority of EOP/EOPS students are from families whose average annual income is less than $10,000. In the case of the community college EOPS students, the reported annual income for their parents is less than $6,000. Clearly, these students must rely on financial aid if they are going to be able to attend college. At the same time, it is doubtful that the EOP/EOPS financial aid package is sufficient to cover all costs required to attend college as a full-time student in any of the three segments. The effect of unmet need on the students' academic progress and attitudes about school cannot be measured by the data in this study, but it would seem reasonable to expect that the amount of funds a student receives and the way in which the funds are packaged would affect the quality of a student's academic performance and progress.

Federal sources provide the largest proportion of funds in all three segments, ranging from 45 percent of the funds in the UC to 89 percent of the funds in the CCC. The federal government provides approximately 66 percent of the EOP aid funds in the CSUC. At the same time, the CSUC receives the largest proportion of state funds -- 35 percent -- compared to approximately 11 percent for the UC and CCC.

Financial aid funds are provided in the form of grants, loans, work/study and scholarships, and financial aid packages in all three segments are generally a combination of the first three. Rarely are EOP/EOPS students in any segment awarded scholarship funds.

Although the proportions of each type of aid provided to EOP/EOPS students vary considerably from campus to campus, the major portion of the funds are provided to EOP/EOPS students in each of the three segments in the form of grants. The second largest proportion of funds provided in the UC and CSUC to EOP students is loans, whereas the second largest proportion for the CCC is work/study. In a few instances, students financial aid is made up almost exclusively of work/study or loans; although this is a rare phenomenon, it occurs more often in the community colleges, where large portions of EOPS students still receive a large proportion of their money in work/study or loans.

The numbers of students enrolled in EOP/EOPS, the proportion receiving financial aid, the costs of the college and the average aid award varies greatly both within and among the colleges in the three segments. Although there are fewer EOP students enrolled in the UC (7,951), a larger proportion of them (approximately 82 percent) receive financial aid. The total amount of financial aid awarded on the 8 campuses of the UC in 1974-75 was $14,843,000. The average first-year aid package received by the EOP students was $2,183. The average yearly costs of attending a UC campus without room and board is about $600. The average unmet need reported for EOP students by the five site visit campuses of the UC was $826.

Approximately 13,585 EOP students are enrolled in the 19 campuses of the CSUC. Of this group, 47 percent receive financial aid. Although the costs of attending a CSUC campus are considerably smaller than the UC -- $200 per year for fees -- the budget provided for 19 campuses was only $5,455,948. Although comparable data were not available for the CCC, we do know that in 1974-75, 36,777 EOPS students were enrolled in 93 colleges and the 1974-75 budget for all financial aid showed that the CCC received for its 93 colleges (and many more students) an amount of financial aid ($41 million) less than the UC received ($76 million) for 8 campuses or the CSUC received ($57 million) for 19 campuses. Although the Governor's Budget for 1976-77 shows a 50 percent increase over the 1975-76 EOP/EOPS budgets for all three segments, the relative proportions of funds provided to the segments are about the same. For 1975-76, the amount of State funds provided to the CCC is still less than the amount provided to the CSUC, which again has considerably fewer colleges and students than the CCC.

Special Support Services

If financial aid can be considered the heart of EOP/EOPS, as was suggested in the previous chapter, then EOP/EOPS services must be considered the backbone of the programs. According to many of the people interviewed on the campuses, the success of EOP/EOPS rests on the effectiveness of its support services. Almost everyone assumes that these services are critical to the maintenance of students' academic, social and psychological welfare.

Although the range of services varies among and between the campuses in each segment, no program is without at least one type of supportive service -- usually tutoring or counseling. Typically, all of the programs offer some form of recruitment and admissions assistance, orientation activities, tutoring and counseling in addition to financial assistance and advising. Ideally, the support services are intended to provide for all of the EOP/EOPS students' needs -- from academic skill development to personal counseling -- in order to insure the students' continued success once they are enrolled in college. At least as originally intended, the support services were conceived of as primarily retention facilitating devices.

More recently, and particularly as a result of the increasing trend towards institutionalization on many of the campuses, the support services originally designed for EOP/EOPS students exclusively have developed into more sophisticated campus-wide programs for all students. Tutorial assistance, for example, was originally provided for EOP/EOPS students because, since they were supposedly academically disadvantaged, it was assumed that they would need tutoring in order to keep up with college level work. Probably as a result of the increasing numbers of skill-deficient high school graduates, including those who have earned quite respectable GPAs, tutorial assistance, once solely the province of EOP/EOPS students, now ranges from individual tutoring on an appointment basis to tutorial centers housed in large learning resources and media centers, and has become a mainstay for many so-called traditional students.

In fact, EOP/EOPS has been credited with providing the impetus and the model for the system of peer tutoring provided to students campus-wide. At the same time, much concern has been expressed by EOP/EOPS staff and students that services offered on a campus-wide basis to all students no longer take into consideration, and thus no longer serve, the special needs of EOP/EOPS students for whom they were originally designed.

All campuses in each segment have available to EOP/EOPS students tutoring and counseling. No one seems to question whether and in what combination these students need tutoring and counseling; these are the two traditional remedies, and as such are often accepted as a given. The assumption is made that EOP/EOPS students need counseling and that all counseling is good. Not a shred of evidence exists concerning the impact of counseling generally or the different types of counseling specifically*.

On almost all of the campuses within the three segments, the EOP/EOPS counseling program is incorporated into the campus-wide counseling facilities. There is usually one full-time EOP/EOPS professional counselor and a number of peer counselor/advisors, many of whom are former or current EOP/EOPS students. On some of the campuses, peer counselor/advisors also serve as tutors. College administrators (and in a few cases, EOP/EOPS administrators), as well as the professional counselors, of course, maintain that professional counselors are more effective than peer counselors, particularly since many of the problems faced by EOP/EOPS students

*Even what we have termed "personal" counseling, as opposed to academic counseling, ranges from assistance in completing forms and assistance in using campus resources to the distinctive application of various counseling theories in dealing with the needs and problems of disadvantaged students in an "alien" environment.

are non-academic. According to the EOP/EOPS students interviewed in the site visits and surveyed in The Study of EOPS, however, they do not participate in the official counseling programs and are reluctant to use campus-wide counseling facilities.* Few of the professional counselors are of minority backgrounds, and minority students particularly do not like to discuss their personal problems with a Caucasian counselor.

In addition, many EOP/EOPS students view the campus-wide counseling center as too "clinically oriented" and formal -- counselors meet with students on an appointment basis only. They are seldom available on a "here and now" basis. As a result of all of these factors, the EOP/EOPS students prefer to use peer counselors/advisors and/or peer tutors (many split the two functions, serving half-time in each capacity) who more often become part of a total support system for the student, serving as advisor, brother/sister, mentor and pal.

Evidence regarding the effectiveness of tutoring is equally elusive. Like the counseling staff, most of the campuses in the three segments employ one full-time tutoring coordinator who directs a cadre of peer tutors (upper division or graduate students in the UC and CSUC), a good portion of whom are former or current EOP/EOPS students. Although there seems to be much that is positive in the approach that is used in the three segments, certainly as far as the EOP/EOPS students are concerned, rarely is it systematic. Few of the campuses provide systematic

*Other studies (e.g. Gordon, 1969) have found this to be the case with regular students also.

training for the tutors or provide them with comprehensive diagnostic information about their tutee's learning problems. Rarely do tutors meet with the coordinator on a regular basis to discuss tutoring problems or cases, and coordination between faculty and tutors is even less frequent.

Most tutors across segments are chosen for their subject-matter ability, and as such, do not necessarily know how to help a student who has a learning problem. Again, they are not provided with training which enables them either to diagnose learning disorders or provide the remedies for them. On other campuses (mostly in the CCC), tutors are chosen merely because they are of minority background (and work/study money is available) and are purportedly better able to relate to the student.

Learning Centers or clinics which house a variety of educational media, and usually include a reading clinic and writing laboratory, proliferate campuses in the CSUC and are present on many in the CCC. (They have yet to become a viable concept in the UC). Some serve students campus-wide; others combine campus-wide services with special tutoring services for EOP/EOPS students only. The impact of these centers on the academic progress of either EOP or, for that matter, non-EOP students, is largely unknown. Again, most of the data that are available are descriptive-- the number and variety of carrels or programmed texts, the number of hours each day the facility is open and the number of students it serves. But according to the EOP/EOPS students, as with the campus-wide

counseling facilities, they are reluctant to use campus-wide tutoring or other services provided by these centers; unequivocally, they prefer their peer tutors, and will turn to them whether or not they are really academically qualified or sufficiently trained.

Support services may indeed be equally as important as financial assistance in ensuring the retention and ultimate success of EOP/EOPS students. But again, in the absence of substantive data, this can only be assumed to be true.

The administration and staffing of programs in general and the special service and financial aid components in particular is clouded by the many practical variations in program organization between segments and among campuses within segments. All program components of EOP/EOPS in the three segments are diverse in their conception, implementation and emphases because of the particular campus contexts within which they exist. So then of necessity are administrative and staffing arrangements.

Not only are the different segments, as well as campuses within segments, serving somewhat different types of students through their programs, but they also have other contingencies upon which to make administrative and staffing decisions. For example, some institutions receive substantial amounts of non-State funds; others have extensive learning resource centers for the entire student body; still others simply provide more visible and substantive top level administrative support -- financial and

otherwise. Furthermore, there exist basic philosophical differences between EOP directors concerning program delivery. These are among the factors which have molded program differences and have resulted in different organizational, administrative and staffing procedures.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

EOP/EOPS in California arose as part of the mid-1960s' War on Poverty, and, like all programs of compensatory education that arose out of that era, its successes and failures have been the subject of heated debate and examination ever since. Perhaps also, like its younger siblings, Title I, Head Start and Follow Through, too much has been expected of it. Naive reformers who expected that massive social problems could be eliminated or even significantly alleviated with large doses of money were bound to be disappointed with compensatory education programs regardless of the level of schooling involved. But this seems to be particularly true with respect to EOP/EOPS, which has relatively modest resources compared to the magnitude of the problem. Even more, EOP/EOPS reaches a very limited number of students, particularly compared to other compensatory education programs in the United States.

Still, at the same time, there is every reason to believe that EOP/EOPS has made a major difference in the lives of many individuals for whom it provided the opportunity of a college education. The impact or value of a college education, of course, is as cloudy an issue for EOP/EOPS students as it is for all students.

The fundamental issue which underlies the questioning of the worth of college education, as well as the value of EOP/EOPS, however, is the lack of systematic and rigorous evaluations to establish their validity and impact. This study, like the two previous EOP/EOPS studies commissioned by the California legislature, as well as many of the other so-called evaluations of compensatory education programs, is basically descriptive; it is not evaluative. The studies describe the functioning and operation of the program and some of the characteristics of the students enrolled. This was the charge of the legislature, and that charge was fulfilled. Unfortunately, however, descriptive data alone cannot contribute to the already sparse literature about the effectiveness of the programs or the impacts of the program components.

Certainly, there are success stories -- some are published in the yearly EOP Report for the CSUC; others are talked about on the campuses. We talked to many students who were grateful for EOP/EOPS and felt that were it not for the opportunity to attend college provided by EOP/EOPS and the assistance provided to help them stay in college, their lives would have gone in vastly different directions. We met former EOP/EOPS students who were leading exemplary productive and happy lives. Probably many more exist. We met and talked with dedicated staff who in some cases maintained their commitment and dedication despite unsupportive administrators, absymal facilities and a goodly portion of hostile faculty.

Still, the success of EOP/EOPS cannot be measured by the handful of satisfied students we met, the dedication of its staff or the size of its funding. Like other compensatory education programs in the United States today, EOP/EOPS have failed to document their design or their implementation. Although the programs are vastly different within and between segments, it is impossible to identify a "successful" program or a "successful" program component. There is simply no data available on which to base such a claim.

Unfortunately, in many cases, the precipitious beginnings of EOP/EOPS are still affecting the operation and functioning of the programs. The lack of careful planning and clearly set goals, perhaps understandable in earlier years, continue to characterize many of the programs and to affect the shape and direction of EOP/EOPS, particularly in the CSUC and CCC. There is still evidence of a great lack of planning and a scarcity of defined program goals. A few still call upon the "intents and spirit" of enabling legislation, even though it has been some 8 or 10 years since that legislation was enacted.

In many programs, staff still do not have tenure, the status of a faculty member or a position of authority and respect. As a result, high staff turnover still characterizes many of the programs and adds a strong element of instability. Faculty are still seldom consulted about the tutoring needs of the EOP/EOPS students or appropriate curricular offerings. No educative programs of any kind have been developed to apprise faculty about EOP/EOPS or enlist their support. In those instances where

faculty are basically supportive of EOP/EOPS, lack of consultation is unfortunate and restricts the faculty members from providing effective assistance to the students. In the worst of situations, the lack of consultation and involvement has, at least in part, added to the hostile environments that still exist on many campuses. Particularly in the CSUC, which emphasizes the enrollment of "high-risk, high-potential" students who do not have the academic credentials to enter CSUC institutions, a small but significant portion of the faculty are still suspicious of "EOP-types" who will "lower the standards", despite the evidence that EOP/EOPS students perform as well academically as their non EOP/EOPS counterparts. This feeling is also found among a good portion of the faculty in the CCC, even though the emphasis in the community colleges has shifted from one of access to assistance and large proportions of EOPS students are identified from among those already enrolled in the college.

Most programs have become institutionalized in one sense or another, more so in the UC and CCC, but even in the CSUC there are few programs that are still strictly structural appendages. At the same time, on several campuses, the nature of the commitment to EOP/EOPS is tenuous both from an emotional as well as a financial standpoint. Programs found to be lacking in emotional commitment were characterized by an unsupportive administration, a lack of EOP/EOPS representation on campus policy-making bodies, poor facilities isolated from the mainstream of the campus and the existence of a vocal and powerful group of non-supportive faculty.

On those campuses where emotional support for EOP/EOPS was found, it was characterized by the opposite conditions -- representatives of EOP/EOPS sit on official policy-making bodies of the college and have input to policy decisions that affect EOP/EOPS; the facilities, if not sumptuous, are adequate, and most important, are centrally and conveniently located; the program components are highly coordinated; involvement with and interaction between faculty and administrators and EOP/EOPS staff and students is frequent and positive; and EOP/EOPS staff have status as a faculty member in a department or are eligible for tenure or permanent status. It may well be that lack of emotional commitment is a far more important factor than institutional financial commitment in-so-far as the former creates an atmosphere of hostility and an "alien environment" -- a situation referred to so often by EOP/EOPS staff and students.

Because the programs exist in such a wide range of campus environments, it is extremely difficult to evaluate them rigorously from Statewide or even systemwide perspectives. Even if the campus programs defined criteria by which to determine program success, evaluative judgements about program effectiveness as related to students' performance, progress, "social competence" or satisfaction would still have to be made within the context of an understanding of the local political situation. The fact that EOP/EOPS students continue to endure at all on some hostile campuses with unsupportive administrations is remarkable.

However, even some institutions which have supportive environments, do not have significant numbers of minority faculty or administrators on their campuses. The deleterious effect of the lack of appropriate role models on the personal development as well as the aspirations and goals of women has been well documented.* It is fairly safe to assume that the lack of appropriate minority role models also influences the goals and lives of the minority students on the campuses, a major portion of whom are EOP/EOPS students. The lack of minority faculty to whom they can turn must certainly influence the urgency of the EOP/EOPS students' relationships with the two support groups available to them -- tutors and counselors.

That tutoring and counseling are assumed to be valuable support services for EOP/EOPS students despite the fact that their effectiveness has never been evaluated has already been discussed. The fact that, regardless of the lack of evaluation, EOP/EOPS-sponsored tutoring and counseling services have in many cases developed into or become part of campus-wide services provided to all students has also been discussed. These issues will not be re-examined here, except to say again that, from the students' perspective and probably due at least in part to the lack of minority role models on the campuses, the availability of tutors -- especially peer tutors of the same ethnic background -- may contribute greatly to students' progress in and satisfaction with school.

*See, e.g. Rose, C. (Ed.) Meeting Women's New Educational Needs, New Directions for Higher Education, Vol. III. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

We can only speculate that the psychosocial benefits of a "friend" or "buddy" who shares a common background and a common goal can do much toward alleviating the strangeness and impersonal atmosphere of a college campus. The issue of whether or not these components should receive more funds or be expanded cannot, of course, be addressed with the data currently available regarding them.

Another issue which must ultimately be addressed with regard to support services is the length of time they are available to EOP/EOPS students. At the present time, the general emphasis in the CSUC and CCC is on providing services to EOP/EOPS students during their first year. The assumption is that a large dose of tutoring and counseling will help the student establish an acceptable academic pattern which will carry the student through the rest of his/her college program.

Even in the absence of evaluative data, it is hard to imagine that a few hours of support a day in their first year will inoculate a disadvantaged student against all future academic or personal problems that might be encountered during the student's college program. Other compensatory education programs nave found that it takes an intensive and sustained program to have an effect on disadvantaged children's performance. It is not unreasonable to expect this to also be true in the case of older students who have an even longer history of educational deprivation.

It should also be noted that support services on the campuses consist primarily of tutoring, counseling and financial aid assistance. Few schools offer specially to EOP/EOPS students other types of services, such as job placement and career and graduate program advising. The few institutions that do provide career guidance or graduate school advisement to EOP/EOPS students are UC campuses. One UC campus in particular has helped EOP students quite successfully in this area, placing them in top graduate schools all over the country and in fields not normally chosen by minority students generally.

It is impressive that EOP/EOPS students do as well while in college as they do given the tremendous pressures that are placed on them by the program itself. In fact, the requirements of the EOP/EOPS may well be unrealistic. That is, EOP/EOPS students are for the most part required to take a full course load. A good majority of them also work as part of their financial aid packaging. This is particularly true in the community colleges, where a large portion of aid is provided in the form of work/study. Add to these hours of classroom instruction and part-time work a number of tutoring hours, which on some campuses are mandatory, and it seems a bit too much to expect of these students, particularly those who may have a more difficult time mastering the academic material because of basic learning deficiencies or disadvantaged academic backgrounds.

The requirement of a full load may have initially been established to appease faculty who were opposed to opening the doors to academically less able students, but it flies in the face of sound educational policy. An essential ingredient of college is the socialization process; it is also an implicit, if not explicit goal of EOP/EOPS to bring disadvantaged and minority students into the mainstream of college life. It is difficult, if not impossible to imagine that any EOP/EOPS student who is enrolled in a full course load, works and receives tutoring can afford to spend much time becoming part of the socialization process of college. This lack of social integration may well bear a strong relationship and be counter-productive to both the academic progress of students and future relations between peoples.

Compensatory type educational programs, even more than traditional programs, emphasize the teacher's responsibility for the learning process. Yet, few faculty in any segment of postsecondary education have ever received training as teachers. The myth still prevails that degrees and credentials qualify one to be a teacher. In all segments, faculty know much more about their disciplines than about the ways by which it can best be taught. If faculty are not trained in the most effective ways of teaching or evaluating their instructional competence for students generally, their lack is even more evident when teaching students who are the products of deprived academic backgrounds or have learning problems or disabilities.

Few faculty have the expertise to differentiate between student learning problems and subject matter difficulties. Few have the training to develop special programs or course elements for disadvantaged and minority students who may need different methods of teaching to fit their individual learning styles. If an institution is to be truly responsive to the EOP/EOPS students it is endeavoring to move through its process, it should provide the kind of staff development programs that will enable the faculty to be more effective, both in terms of instructional competence and curricular development. Other than the development of Ethnic Studies programs in a number of schools, no essential changes in the college curriculum occurred in response to or in conjunction with EOP/EOPS or other programs for the disadvantaged. In order to be responsive, institutions could encourage faculty and departments to work with representatives from EOP/EOPS staffs and educational specialists who have been trained in instructional areas as well as curriculum development. New courses that might be of particular interest to minority and disadvantaged students, and new teaching methods that might be more effective could result from these joint efforts.

Based on the overview presented in the preceding pages, the data contained in this report and information obtained through interviews with faculty, administrators, EOP/EOPS staff and students, as well as segment officials, the following conclusions and recommendations are offered as a base for institutional examination and, hopefully, as a stimulus to greater collaboration and commitment.

In most instances, the recommendations are based on a combination of quantifiable objective data and the impressions and the opinions of the people interviewed. Generally, the data support the perceptual information, but in a few cases there were discrepancies. In these cases, recommendations are not supported by documented, quantifiable data, but represent the collective opinions and attitudes of the interviewees, the observations of the site visit teams and the observations and experiences of the authors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. All of the colleges in each segment, in conjunction with their segment offices, should review and redefine the objectives of their EOP/EOPS in light of the goals and purposes of the particular institution.

2. All of the colleges, in conjunction with their segment offices where appropriate, should clarify the criteria for students' eligibility for EOP/EOPS.

3. The colleges should clarify their target populations as part of their objective and policy review process.

4. The CSUC should make its admissions policies better known to the campuses and see that they are more adequately implemented by the campuses within an understanding of individual campus differences. More of the exception admissions places should be used for disadvantaged students.

5. GPA should no longer be used as the primary criterion of student performance or EOP/EOPS effectiveness.

6. Retention data <u>per se</u> should receive much less emphasis in judging student success and program effectiveness than is currently the case.

7. Follow-up studies of former EOP/EOPS students should be initiated on all campuses.

8. Institutions should be encouraged to carefully assess each student's ability to handle college-level work and award greater attention to individual differences when recommending appropriate course loads.

9. Each college should provide for input from EOP/EOPS staff regarding each student's ability to handle the emotional and economic pressures of loans and work/study.

10. State-funded grant monies should not be consolidated.

11. Top-level administrative support should be intensified at both the segment and campus level, and assurances should be made that EOP/EOPS will receive comparable financial consideration and treatment and at least a minimum level of funding for a specified period as do other programs contingent upon renewed funding.

12. Criteria by which to judge the effectiveness of support services should be defined by each campus and extensive evaluation based on the criteria undertaken.

13. All persons assigned as tutors, peer or otherwise, should be provided with an organized, well planned and intensive "tutor training" program.

14. Faculty should be directly involved in the tutorial program, working cooperatively with the tutors and students as a team.

15. Staff development programs should be instituted or expanded on all campuses.

16. The EOP/EOPS Director and/or staff should be included in policy making and decisions regarding student support services, particularly with respect to those policies or decisions affecting EOP/EOPS students. Further, at least a certain number of counselors and tutors should be selected for their sensitivity and ability to work effectively with disadvantaged and minority students.

17. EOP/EOPS Directors should enjoy the same privileges and status as other individuals in comparable-level positions elsewhere on the campuses or in the segment offices.

18. Individual campuses, in consultation with segment offices where appropriate, should evaluate yearly the distribution of funds for services and grants on the basis of a systematic analysis of the EOP/EOPS students' needs.

19. Campuses should have the option of offering services to EOP/EOPS students beyond the first year, depending upon individual student need.

20. EOP/EOPS should be systematically evaluated on the campuses and in the segment offices. EOP/EOPS funds should be augmented so that a proportion of the funding can be used for this purpose.

21. A well-planned, systematic and sensible data collection and information management system should be developed with evaluation criteria as its base. Less data of the type that is currently being requested by the segment offices should be collected and less frequent demands for data should be made.

Project Reports, Publications and Presentations

Rose, C. and Nyre, G.F. Access and Assistance: The Study of EOP/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education. Vol. I. Final report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1976.

Rose, C. and Nyre, G.F. (Ed.) Access and Assistance: The Study of EOP/EOPS in California's Public Institutions of Higher Education. Vol. II. Case Study Profiles. Final report to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1976.

Rose, C. and Nyre, G.F. Holistic Evaluation: An Empirically Developed Approach for Comprehensive Program Evaluation. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977.

See also Farland, R.W., Rose, C., Nyre, G.F. and Trent, J.W. The Study of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services in California's Community Colleges. Sacramento: Board of Governors and the Office of the Chancellor, California Community Colleges, 1976.

The report consists of seven chapters and appendices. The chapters cover objectives and methodology, scope and staffing of EOPS program components, EOPS students, dimensions of the Community Colleges, community outreach, college appraisals of statewide coordination and guidelines, conclusions and discussion, and case study profiles.

Appendices include data-gathering instruments and planning materials, tabular data, case-study documents and development of self-concept measures. A detailed bibliography of related literature is also included.